

A Critical Reappraisal of Eustathios Makrembolites' *Hysmine and Hysminias**

MARGARET ALEXIOU

Historians of literature have not been kind to the Byzantine learned romance, least of all to Eustathios Makrembolites' *Hysmine and Hysminias*, written in the second half of the twelfth century. As early as 1670, P. D. Huet wrote: '... rien n'est plus froid, rien n'est plus plat, rien n'est plus ennuyeux: nulle bienséance, nulle vray-semblance, nulle conduite; c'est le travail d'un escolier, ou de quelque chetif sophiste, qui meritoit d'estre escolier toute sa vie'.¹ Krumbacher calls it 'ein in nervösen Windungen aufgeführter stilistischer Eiertanz';² and Rohde considers its only originality to be that it is 'die echt byzantinische Verquickung von süsslicher Ziererei mit wahrhaft ungeschlachter Rohheit des Wesens, welche sie überall merken

* This article is developed from a paper, 'Byzantine Learned Romance', delivered to the Byzantine Studies Seminar (Birmingham, February 1975), and to the University Seminar in Medieval Studies (Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire, November 1975). For many invaluable suggestions on a wide range of aspects I am greatly indebted to participants in the discussion. I am also deeply grateful to Peter Dronke (Clare Hall, Cambridge) for reading this article in its present form and for his comments and suggestions, especially on the western material, although I must emphasize that any weaknesses in respect of western parallels are entirely my own responsibility.

1. P. D. Huet, *Traité de l'origine des romans* (Paris, 1670; reprinted Stuttgart, 1966), pp. 51–2.

2. K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur*, 2nd ed. (Munich, 1897), p. 764.

lassen'.³ As recently as 1967, B. Perry curtly dismisses all four Byzantine learned romances in one paragraph as 'slavish imitations of Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus . . . written in the twelfth century by miserable pedants'.⁴

It is my purpose here to question the validity of these indictments, following some suggestive leads given by Gigante⁵ and Hunger.⁶ Are the Byzantine learned romances slavish imitations of ancient models? What is the quality of their imitation, and what new elements do we find? Do they reflect contemporary society and culture, or are they just a 'dim and distorting mirror' of reality?⁷ Recent studies by Hunger, Každan and Tsolakis have shown that the romances of Theodore Prodromos, Niketas Eugenianos and Konstantine Manasses not only contain several interesting allusions to contemporary historical events, but also reflect a genuine attempt to re-create in a twelfth-century context, insofar as the conventions of learned literature permitted, a genre which had ceased to exist.⁸

3. E. Rohde, *Der griechische Roman*, 4th ed. (Hildesheim, 1960), p. 560.

4. B. E. Perry, *The Ancient Romances* (University of California Press, Berkeley, 1967), p. 103. Other adverse criticism includes W. Schmid, in *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. A. Pauly, G. Wissowa and W. Kroll (Stuttgart, 1894–), VI (1909), 1075–7: 'Der Roman ist das unnatürliche Produkt eines innerlich kalten und rohen, mit widerwärtiger Präntention griechische Kultur und attischen Geschmack heuchelnden Stümpers. . . . Der Roman hat als eine Erscheinung des Kunstzerfalls nur pathologisches Interesse'; and F. Dölger, *Die byzantinische Dichtung in der Reinsprache* (Berlin, 1948), pp. 20–1.

5. M. Gigante, 'Il romanzo di Eustathio Makrembolites', *Akten des XI Internationalen Byzantinischen Kongress München 1958* (Munich, 1960), pp. 168–81.

6. H. Hunger, 'Die byzantinische Literatur der Komnenenzeit, Versuch einer Neubewertung', *Anzeiger phil.-hist. Klasse Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften*, CV (1968), pp. 59–76.

7. This view of Byzantine literature in general is put forward by C. Mango, 'Byzantine literature as a distorting mirror', Inaugural lecture delivered before the University of Oxford (Oxford, 1975).

8. Hunger, op. cit., pp. 72–6; A. Každan, 'Bemerkungen zu Niketas Eugenianos', *JÖBG*, XVI (1967), 101–17; E. Tsolakis, *Συμβολή στη μελέτη τοῦ ποιητικοῦ ἔργου τοῦ Κωνσταντίνου Μανασσῆ καὶ κριτικὴ ἐκδόση τοῦ μυθιστορηματός του "Τὰ κατ' Ἀρίστανδρον καὶ Καλλιθέαν"* (Thessaloniki, 1967); A. D. Aleksidze, *Vizantijskij roman xii veka* (Tbilisi, 1965), p. 17; O. Mazal, *Der Roman des Konstantinos Manasses* (Wiener Byzantinische Studien, IV [Vienna, 1967]).

The present study will be restricted to Eustathios' romance, because it indicates several original and important departures in the history of the romance, both in its form and content.

About Eustathios himself we know very little, except that he flourished in the second half of the twelfth century, and that he probably assumed the name Eustathios after becoming a monk, his original name being Eumathios.⁹ Apart from the romance, he is the author of a collection of verse enigmas, and one letter. A further letter has survived, probably written before 1186, from Theodore Balsamon, addressing him as τῷ ἐπάρχῳ κυρῷ Εὐμαθίῳ τῷ Μακρεμβολίτῃ.¹⁰ Chadzis' theory, that he was the author of the Athens version of *Digenis Akritas*, is based on tenuous evidence and unsound argument, and has not been generally credited.¹¹ Our romance, which is called *drama*, is in archaizing but syntactically fairly simple prose, and is divided into eleven books. Over twenty manuscripts are extant, dating from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century and after.¹²

The romance is not easy to summarize because there is no conventional plot; but it is important to give a general outline before attempting a more detailed analysis, since, so

9. Evidence on the life and work of Eustathios has been summarized by Rohde, *op. cit.*, pp. 356–8.

10. See Krumbacher, *op. cit.*, p. 319.

11. A. Chadzis, *Εὐστάθιος Μακρεμβολίτης καὶ Ἀκρητής, Ἀθηνᾶ*, LIV (1950), 134–76, 317; LV (1951), 184–226; LVI (1952), 278–85. For a summary of differing views and of the present position on the question of the authorship of the Athens version, see H.-G. Beck, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Volksliteratur* (Munich, 1971), 65–6.

12. Seventeen manuscripts are listed by P. Le Bas in the preface to his edition, *De Hysmines et Hysminiae Amoribus Fabula*, in: G. Hirschig, *Erotici Scriptores* (Paris, 1856). Two are of the thirteenth century (Vatican A, Barberinus D), one is dated 1365 (Paris G), three are of the fifteenth century (Paris H, Munich Q, R), ten of the sixteenth century (Vatican B, C, Milan F, Paris I, K, L, M, N, O, Munich P), and one undated (Barberinus E). Minor lacunae occur in several manuscripts, but substantial omissions in only three. A further manuscript, originating from Paris and dating from the late eighteenth century, has recently been acquired by the University of Birmingham, MSS 7/i/4. Attractively bound, octavo size, it is written in a neat, small hand with impeccable orthography. The initial letter of each book is decorated, and 'pointing fingers' have been added in the margin to alluring passages. Although it was probably copied from a printed edition, and is of little textual importance, it confirms that the romance continued to be read in its complete form.

far as I can determine, no accurate summary has yet been made.¹³

Hysminias begins his narrative in Book I with a description of his native city Eurykomis, where the people are celebrating the feast of the Diasia. He is elected by lot as herald, and sent off with due ceremony to the city of Aulikomis, where he is entertained by the wealthy Sosthenes, who holds a lavish banquet in his honour. He is struck by the beauty of Sosthenes' daughter, Hysmine, who serves the wine, but embarrassed and amused by her immodest behaviour: she presses her ankle against his foot under the table, touches his hand as she passes the wine, and even tickles and kisses his feet when—according to the custom pertaining to heralds—she washes them after the meal. In the night he is awakened by Kratisthenes, who has come with him from Eurykomis, and teasingly interrogated about his conquest of Hysmine. He dismisses this conquest as a joke, and goes back to sleep. In Book II he visits the garden with Kratisthenes, and the two examine in the summer-house a large frieze depicting in the central scene a winged and naked youth armed with bow, arrows and a torch, seated on a chariot, and followed by throngs of people. Again Hysmine makes immodest advances to him at the evening meal, and again Kratisthenes teases him; but he denies that he is in love, and falls asleep. Book III describes the sequence of dreams he experiences that night. First Eros, the figure in the frieze, appears and enrolls him as slave, angrily and forcibly joining his hand to Hysmine's. He wakes up, panic-stricken, and tells Kratisthenes that he is now a slave of Aphrodite and must renounce his duties as a herald. Kratisthenes tells him not to be a fool, and goes back to sleep, snoring loudly, leaving him to indulge in half-waking fantasies of his next meeting with Hysmine. Towards dawn he falls asleep, and dreams of making love to Hysmine after a banquet. His argument with Kratisthenes is continued the next day during a walk in the garden, interrupted by Sosthenes, who summons them to yet another meal. This time he responds to Hysmine's advances with passionate glances, and is unable to eat or drink.

13. The fullest summary is still that made by J. Dunlop in 1814; see J. Dunlop, *History of Prose Fiction*, revised by H. Wilson (London, 1888), I, pp. 77–82; but, in spite of its detail and many useful notes, its presentation is misleading and prejudiced.

In Book IV he finds her alone in the garden, and presses his attentions upon her, much to her surprise in view of his former indifference. After he and Kratisthenes have retired to their room, he slips out in the hope of finding Hysmine, but his friend notices his absence and drags him back to bed. They have another long argument, but eventually Kratisthenes falls asleep, and Hysminias, hearing a noise in the garden, goes out again to find Hysmine standing alone by a well. Their embraces are interrupted by a woman's voice calling Hysmine into the house, and he returns to his room, to be admonished once more by Kratisthenes. He is sleepless, torn between duty and passion. In the feverish dream sequences which open Book V, he dreams first of love-making, then of Hysmine dressed as a bride, and third that he is in the garden with Hysmine, caught *in flagrante* by her mother Panthia. She screams abuse at him, and suddenly a host of avenging women pursues him, threatening to tear him to pieces. He cries out in his sleep to Kratisthenes, who shakes him and explains that the noise is real, since Sosthenes is at the door telling them to get up and greet the crowd of people outside who are clamouring to crown him as herald. During the festivities his parents arrive, and invite Sosthenes and his family to Eurykomis for a return visit. The whole party sails to Eurykomis, and a lavish banquet is held. At night, while all the parents depart to sacrifice to Zeus Xenios, he goes to Hysmine's bedside. They swear eternal love, but she refuses to sacrifice her virginity. He is woken by his mother in Book VI in time for yet another banquet, during which Sosthenes announces that he has arranged a good match for Hysmine and invites the company to take part in the wedding celebrations at Aulikomis. After the meal, the parents go off to make propitiating sacrifices for Hysmine's wedding, while he goes again to Hysmine's room and laments. The next day Zeus sends an evil omen, so after a more frugal meal, the parents have to make yet further sacrifices. Kratisthenes seizes the chance to tell him that he has found a boat which will take the three of them to Syria, and goes off to make arrangements, leaving him to dream of the sea, waves, and Hysmine's embraces. In Book VII, during a further convenient absence of all the parents and Kratisthenes, he tells Hysmine of their planned elopement. His attempt to make love to her is interrupted by Kratisthenes, with the news that the boat

is about to depart and there is no time to waste. After prayers to Poseidon the ship sails off in calm seas, and the lovers embrace, lulled by the waves. The next day brings a storm, and the captain declares that only a human sacrifice will placate the sea-god's wrath. The lot falls on Hysmine, and the captain casts her overboard, listing all the precedents for human sacrifice in classical mythology as he does so. The lamentations of the bereft Hysminias become so unbearable that the captain dumps him too at the next landing-place, where he weeps himself to sleep and dreams of Eros leading Hysmine from the waves. In Book VIII he is captured by Ethiopian pirates, who launch a savage attack on a city and cram the trireme with booty and Greek-speaking captives. Three days later, while the pirates disembark to eat, drink and sleep, he debates with the captives on board about the best course of action. Then an army of Greeks arrives, vanquishes the pirates, and sells the captives in the city of Daphnopolis as slaves. After praying at the shrine of Apollo he makes his way to the house of his new master and mistress. Time passes; the feast of Diasia comes round again. This time his master is chosen as herald, and the household departs for Artykomis. In Book IX, now only a menial servant, he remembers his past happiness. During the welcome shown to his master his right eye keeps twitching, and, thinking of Theokritos, he takes this as a good omen. Sure enough, at the banquet which follows, one of the maidservants attending the host's daughter Rhodope looks suspiciously like Hysmine. She recognizes him, and sends a letter explaining how she was saved by a dolphin and sold as a slave. Under the pretence of being cousins, they constantly seek each other's company. She warns him that Rhodope is in love with him, and finds herself in the role of messenger. In Book X there is an exchange of love-letters, in which he writes fondly to Rhodope but bestows his embraces upon Hysmine. After further celebrations in honour of his master, the herald, a solemn sacrifice to Apollo is held at night, attended by the entire household. At the altar two elderly couples—none other than the parents of the lovers—are found lamenting their lost children. There is a recognition scene, and the priest declares the lovers free, offering protection in his shrine, much to the anger of Rhodope and her father. But the priest declares that Greeks, both by law and by nature, must be

free; and when the lovers are dragged from the shrine he threatens to renounce his priesthood unless the crowd returns them unharmed. The crowd takes action, and there is general drinking, dancing and singing as they are crowned as free. Book XI describes the festivities which continue on the following day. During a banquet held by the priest, the lovers tell their stories, as a result of which it is decided that Hysmine should take the virginity test at the springs of Artemis in Daphnopolis. She passes, to the surprise and relief of all (including the reader), and they return to Aulikomis to celebrate the wedding. Hysminias draws the concluding moral, that love, chastity and wisdom will be rewarded in spite of the reversals of fortune.

The aspects of this unusual romance I wish to discuss are: first, narrative technique (perspectives of time, place and viewpoint); second, motifs drawn from ancient romances, classical allusions and style; and third, use of dreams.

Throughout the romance the author adheres to a strict and explicit time-schedule. The first five books cover only four days and nights, which describe in some detail Hysminias' gradual awakening of love for Hysmine. Two days and three nights are covered in Books VI and VII, when at last some action takes place. Book VIII continues with the eighth day, after which there is a break of three days indicating Hysminias' voyage with the pirates, and an account of the eleventh day. Then there is a substantial break in fictional time—probably a year, assuming that the Diasia was an annual festival—to suggest Hysminias' establishment in his new surroundings. Book IX covers three days, crucial to the *dénouement* of the plot, and Books X and XI continue with an account of the remaining three days and nights. Thus, in eleven books, the principal action is distributed over no more than fourteen actual days, the total fictional time being about a year. There are no abrupt changes of tempo: although the first five books are the slowest-moving, averaging rather less than one day and night in each, in the remaining six the maximum speed is only three days and nights (Book X). The main difference between the two parts of the romance lies in the type and density of the action. Books I–V concentrate on emotion and fantasy, while the action, in the conventional sense, is condensed into Books VI–XI. It is indicative that nights occupy a proportion equal to—if not greater than—days in

Books I–V, and an important part of Books VI–VIII, while they are almost entirely absent in Books IX–XI.

Unlike other ancient or Byzantine romances, this one deliberately avoids specifying any real geographical location. Apart from Syria, the proposed destination of the ship on which the lovers elope, and the River Rhine, on whose banks is situated the city of Artykomis, no real place is mentioned, although references to Ethiopians and barbarians on the one hand, and to Hellenes and Philhellenes on the other, abound. Eustathios has therefore discarded the last vestiges of historiography from his romance, which is not, and does not claim to be, any more than pure fiction.¹⁴ The similarities of the names of the characters and of the cities they pass through is confusing, but it serves to increase the fairy-tale atmosphere. The movement is cyclical: in the first five books we go from Eurykomis to Aulikomis and return to Eurykomis. In the second part, which repeats the main episodes of the first part, the geographical setting is wider, balancing the greater density of action. We travel from Eurykomis across the sea, eventually reaching Daphnipolis–Artykomis–Daphnipolis, and finally we return to Aulikomis, where the marriage takes place. The setting is unreal, but not vague.

Another innovation is Eustathios' consistent use of first-person viewpoint. Achilles Tatius' *Leukippe and Kleitophon* is also narrated in the first person, but the author introduces his hero in the conventional 'oral epic' way, by describing how he met Kleitophon at Sidon while looking at a painting, and how he was subsequently regaled with the full story of his personal adventures. Eustathios dispenses with this attempt at historical verisimilitude, and presents his romance, from beginning to end, in the *ego* persona of his fictitious hero Hysminias. This constitutes an important step towards true fiction in the modern sense.¹⁵

In his recent book on the ancient romances, T. Hägg distinguishes four levels of first-person narration.¹⁶ First,

14. See Dunlop, I, pp. 81–2; Gigante, p. 169.

15. Ibid.; see also Margaret Schlauch, *Antecedents of the English Novel 1400–1600* (London, 1963), p. 22, for a discussion of the same technique in Christine de Pisan's *Le livre du duc des vrais amans*, written in 1404.

16. T. Hägg, *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances: Studies of Chariton*,

authentic narration, which admits only those events which the narrator has manifestly experienced, and in a form which he may be supposed to remember. Second, the narration follows the registering of events in the *ego* mind, but direct speech and lengthy description are freely admitted, so that the audience does not keep the narrative act constantly in mind. Third, the chronological arrangement of events registered in the *ego* mind is given up, and reference is made to causal connections between events which could not have been made at the time, or events may be described which occurred when the *ego* was not present, without regard to how he learned of them. Fourth, the narrator becomes the omniscient author, and reference is made to events which the *ego* could not possibly have known. Hägg concludes that Achilles Tatius maintains Kleitophon's narrative consistently on the second level until Book II.13, and that from then onwards the narrative is conducted primarily on the third level. In *Hysmine and Hysminias*, however, there is no violation of the second level; no single event or conversation is recorded which Hysminias did not explicitly take part in. The *ekphrasis* are motivated by his presence, and introduced by *ὁρῶ* or *ὁρῶμεν*; when Hysmine's conversation with her parents on the subject of her arranged marriage is referred to, Hysminias says he overheard it: ἀκήκοα (VI.14).

The treatment of character is entirely consistent with this egocentric viewpoint. There is no attempt to introduce parallel action, hence the need for recapitulations is reduced (there are only three in the whole romance, all relatively brief). Kratisthenes disappears after Book VI; presumably he sailed on to Syria, and it is perhaps to Eustathios' credit that he avoided yet another unlikely reunion at the end simply to tie up loose ends. Hysmine's experiences when separated from Hysminias are divulged to the reader only from her letter and from her own recapitulation at the final banquet. Even here, the author is careful to adhere to his time-schedule, and Hysmine says of her experiences at sea, 'I am not sure how many days elapsed'

Xenophon of Ephesus and Achilles Tatius (Shrifterktgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen [Stockholm, 1971]), pp. 127–8. His analysis of tempo and phases of narrative in Achilles Tatius, pp. 63–78, has also served as a model for my analysis of Eustathios' narrative technique.

(XI.14), thus implying a passage of time consistent with Hysminias' narrative. Her change from initial immodesty to later (relative) chastity has been criticized as inconsistent; but since she exists only as seen by Hysminias and not as a character in her own right, the inconsistency is not obtrusive. Romance convention required that the heroine's chastity be maintained until the end: Eustathios adheres to the rules, but his variation of detail shows some insight into female behaviour as viewed by men. Her sexual provocation to make Hysminias fall in love with her lasts only so long as he is indifferent; once captivated and tempted to press his attentions too far, he is subjected to vacillation between responsiveness and withdrawal (V.16–17, VII.1–7).

The chief factor in the successful use of *ego*-narration is the absence of sub-plot and superfluous intrigue. Hysmine's arranged marriage is briefly dealt with, and the only attempt against her chastity is by Hysminias. Her sacrifice on board ship is improbable; but the episode is introduced with deliberate humour and a touch of parody.¹⁷ Rhodope falls in love with Hysminias, inevitably; but the affair could hardly arouse Hysmine's jealousy, since it was carried on only by letters delivered by herself. At the same time, in compensation for the lack of action and intrigue, there is considerable variation in levels of style—narrative, rhetorical laments, stylized *ekphraseis*, and lively, stichomythic dialogues, particularly between Hysminias and Kratisthenes.¹⁸ Here, Eustathios is at an

17. VII. 12–14. The parody is achieved by means of the captain's exaggerated language and use of classical allusion, and also by Hysminias' own description: *Ταῦθ' ὁ μεγαλίστωρ κυβερνήτης ἐφ' ὀφλοῦ καθήμενος ἐρητόρευεν*. . . . (VII.14). It is interesting to compare Eustathios' use of exaggeration in style, literary conventions, stock episodes and adventures, and his anti-heroic treatment of both hero and heroine, with the brilliant parody of the anonymous French 'cantefable', *Aucassin et Nicolette*, written in the first half of the thirteenth century, ed. F. W. Bourdillon (Manchester University Press, 1930). For further studies, see O. Jodogne, 'La parodie et le pastiche dans *Aucassin et Nicolette*', *Cahiers de l'association internationale des lettres françaises*, XII (1960); P. Matarasso, *Aucassin and Nicolette and Other Tales* (Penguin Classics, London, 1971), 17–23. The effect is totally different, since Eustathios writes in Atticizing Greek, whereas the author of the French romance employs the dialect of northern France. The similarities in technique are due to the fact that both authors are parodying an established romance tradition.

18. At the end of Book I, when Hysminias is woken by Kratisthenes in the

advantage over his contemporaries in his choice of prose rather than verse as a medium for the romance, since the level of prose is more easily varied, and moves freely from elevated style to simple, direct language, which, while far from being vernacular, does convey some semblance of authentic speech.

In dealing with Eustathios' debt to the ancient romances, I shall not enumerate all the examples, but indicate how he used the material he borrowed. The work most extensively and freely used is Achilles Tatius' *Leukippe and Kleitophon*. Names are similar to the point of confusion: Leukippe's parents are Sostratos and Pantheia, Hysmine's are Sosthenes and Panthia; Leukippe's mistress' steward is Sosthenes, while Hysmine's master is Sostratos. Almost all the major episodes, as well as minor details, can be paralleled in Achilles Tatius' work. The detail in the painting which instigates Kleitophon's whole narrative is the figure of Eros as a young boy, winged, with bow and torch (I.1.13). Later, when Kleitophon is torn between his incipient passion for Leukippe and the girl he is betrothed to, he hears the voice of Eros declare that he cannot escape the three weapons of Love—fire, bow and arrows, wings (II.2–5). In *Hysmine and Hysminias*, the figure of Eros is central to the painting described in Book II.7–10. The attributes are the same, symbolizing his universal power. Eros asserts his power over Hysminias not as an inner voice, as with Kleitophon, but by appearing in a dream as a mighty *basileus*, and by forcibly enrolling him as slave (III.1.). Eustathios suggests by these means both the fatality of love, and, perhaps, the self-induced nature of passion. There are also hints of parody in the clever juxtaposition of exaggerated rhetoric in the presentation of Eros' power as seen by Hysminias, and of humorous surprise in Kratisthenes' response to the whole episode. Eustathios has

night and asked for an account of the banquet, he replies, with a hint of impatience: *Τάλλα μὲν τοῦ δείπνου, Κρατίσθενης, οἶσθα, καὶ συνανακλινόμενος ἡμῖν καὶ πίνων τοῦ νέκταρος, τὰ δὲ περὶ τὴν κόρην τοιαῦτα*. (I.14). He repeats the story, and Kratisthenes says: “*ὦ τῆς εὐτυχίας, ἀνακέκραγε· παρθένος ἐρᾷ σου, καὶ παρθένος οὕτω καλῇ· σὺ δ' οὐκ ἀντερᾷς;*” *Ἐγὼ δὲ, “Καὶ τί τοῦτο ἐρᾷν”, εἶρηκα. Καὶ παλιν ὁ Κρατισθένης μέγα ἀνακέκραγεν. “Ἡράκλεις, τῆς ἀτοπίας, τῆς ἡλιθιότητος· ἀλλ' ἰλέω σοι Ἔρωσ, μήτηρ Ἀφροδίτη, καὶ ἰῶγγες ἐρωτικάι.” Ἐγὼ δὲ, “Τίνες οὗτοι, πρὸς τὸν Κρατισθένην φημί, τίς δέ μοι τούτων διδάσκαλος;” Ὁ δέ μοι, “Φύσις ζωὴν ἀδίδακτοι.” Πάλιν οὖν ἐπὶ τὸν ὕπνον ἐτράπημεν.*

therefore elaborated a detail from Achilles Tatius into a complex dream-sequence, which recurs, in strikingly similar form, in the prologue to the Athens version of *Digenis Akritas*, and in the vernacular verse romances *Kallimachos and Chrysorrhoe* and *Belthandros and Chrysanza*.¹⁹ That the motif is derived from Eustathios and not from Achilles Tatius seems probable in view of the similar sequence of events (Hero/heroine is indifferent to Love; Eros appears as a king in a picture/dream, armed with three weapons; victim is enrolled as slave (*δουλογραφοῦμαι*)).²⁰

In Achilles Tatius, Kleitophon is encouraged by Satyros to enter Leukippe's room with her prior consent, when the household is asleep at night; but at the crucial moment, Leukippe's mother rushes into the bedroom after a portentous dream. Finding the culprit gone (Kleitophon manages to escape by another door) but circumstances suspicious, she hurls abuse at her daughter for her shameless behaviour (II.23-4). Eustathios has borrowed exactly the same elements—an attempt at the girl's chastity, a dream, abusive accusations from the girl's mother—but has cleverly transferred the episode from reality to a dream (V.3-4).

Other incidents can be briefly summarized: the hospitality shown to the hero by the heroine's parents;²¹ the detailed seating arrangements described at the banquet;²² the heroine's request that the hero should spare her virginity (Leukippe makes the plea only after a dream, and Kleitophon would have been luckier on the first occasion, were it not for Pantheia's untimely intrusion);²³ the elopement of the lovers followed by a storm at sea;²⁴ their coincidental meeting at a much later stage

19. *Dig. Akr.* ATH 157-249, *Kall.* 2160-9, *Belth.* 337-65.

20. *δουλογραφοῦμαι* II.9, III.10, X.8, XI.5; *συνδουλαγωγοῦμαι* IV.20. Cf. *δοῦλον ὁ ἔγραψα Dig. Akr.* ATH 208, *συνδουλογραφῶ Kall.* 740, *δουλογραφοῦμαι* *ibid.* 2168, *δουλογραφῶ* *ibid.* 511, 931, *Belth.* 360. The verb, which is used in these romances especially for captivity by Eros, either directly or indirectly, does not occur in Ancient Greek, and is first used by Eustathios.

21. V.8-10; cf. *Ach. Tat.* I.4-5.

22. V.9, VII, 4; cf. *Ach. Tat.* I.5.

23. V.17, VII.4; cf. *Ach. Tat.* IV.1.

24. VII.7; cf. *Ach. Tat.* II.30-2. In Eustathios, the storm takes place on the following day, and Hysmine is cast overboard (VII.8-15); in Achilles Tatius, the storm occurs three days later, when both Leukippe and Kleitophon are washed overboard and saved by a piece of floating prow (III.1-5).

and in a different place, in the role of servants or captives;²⁵ the hero's mistress falling in love with him (and, in Achilles Tatius, actually seducing him);²⁶ the reunion with parents in a temple and the role of the priest in extricating the lovers from their captors;²⁷ and finally, the virginity testing.²⁸

Less extensive and specific are Eustathios' borrowings from other ancient romances. From Heliodoros' *Aithiopika* he may have taken the idea for a religious setting, with pagan festivals and sacrifices, the pretence that the lovers are related, the description of a city sacked by pirates, and the references to Hellenes and Philhellenes.²⁹ In the last two cases, however, he has selected and deliberately emphasized themes relevant to twelfth-century experience and consciousness—the cruelty of 'barbarians' in sacking cities, as opposed to the inherent superiority of the Hellenes.³⁰ Xenophon's *Ephesiaka* may have provided a model for the deliberate ensnaring of the lovers by Eros (although the treatment of the theme is quite different), and also, perhaps, for the immodesty of the heroine. Anthia, when first captivated, acts as follows: *Διέκειτο δὲ καὶ ἄνθεια πονήρως, ὁλοῖς μὲν καὶ ἀναπεπταμένοις τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς τὸ Ἀβροκόμου κάλλος εἰσρέον δεχόμενη, ἥδη δὲ καὶ τῶν παρθένης πρεπόντων καταφρονοῦσα· καὶ γὰρ ἐλάλησεν ἄν τί, ἢν Ἀβροκόμῃς ἀκούσῃ καὶ μέρη τοῦ σώματος ἐγύμνωσεν ἄν τὰ δυνατὰ, ἢν*

25. IX.7–8; cf. Ach. Tat. V.17–19.

26. IX.15; cf. Ach. Tat. V.11, 26–7.

27. X.14–18; cf. Ach. Tat. VIII.2–4.

28. XI.17–18; cf. Ach. Tat. VIII.12–14.

29. The priest argues for the liberation of hero and heroine from captivity on the grounds that they are Greeks: "Ἐγὼ τῆς νομοθεσίας ὑμῖν, ὡς δουλαγωγεῖτε τοὺς Ἕλληνας. . . Ἀπόλλων χρησιμοδοτεῖ, καὶ τοῖς ἐλευθέροις ἀφαισίουται τὸ ἐλεύθερον, οἷς νόμος Ἑλλήνων πρότερον καὶ φύσις αὐτὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἀπεχαρίσατο." Cf. VIII.9, where Hysminias and his fellow-captives are taken prisoner by Greeks (ὁμογλώττοις Ἕλλησιν), much to Hysminias' dismay. The cruelty of the Ethiopian pirates is stressed in VIII.2, 6–7.

30. Cf. Konst. Manasses, *Arist.* I.2.36: ἀπαγε, μὴ φιλέλληνες οὕτω μαγεῖν ἄνδρες. Tsolakis considers this passage to be based on Heliodoros VII.11.7: οἶσθα γὰρ ὡς φιλέλλην τέ ἐστι καὶ δεξιὸν τι χρῆμα περιζένων ὑποδοχὴν, and VII.19.8: ὁ Θεαγένης τὸ μὲν τῆς φιλοσωφροσύνης καὶ ὡς φιλέλλην τὸ ἥθος καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα συνεπῆνει καὶ χάριν ὁμολόγει, ed. cit. If so, the echo is, I believe, deliberately intended to reflect the conscious revival of Hellenism in the twelfth century.

‘Αβροκόμης ἔδῃ (1.3). Hysmine was bolder, since Anthia’s behaviour is initiated by Habrokomes’ passion and Eros’ intervention, but at least the precedent existed. Longus’ *Daphnis and Chloe* provides the only real parallel to Eustathios’ treatment of the hero’s gradual awakening of love.

This list is not exhaustive; but in spite of numerous parallels, in no single case can Eustathios be accused of slavish imitation. Verbal echoes and classical allusions are deliberate, and serve an entirely different purpose from that of mere copying. Even where details are identical, the borrowed episodes are set in a different context, which is consistent with his centralized treatment of the hero. Within the conventions of the genre, Eustathios’ innovations are more striking than his borrowings: Hysminias is the only hero of an erotic romance who actually laughs in Hysmine’s face at her initial advances (I.12, 14); Hysmine is the only heroine who behaves quite so brazenly without any sign that her affection is returned. Precedents and parallels exist in ancient and western romances for aggressive sexuality in women, but the women are usually older, married, of lower rank or of Oriental race.³¹ Is there also a suggestion of satire in Eustathios’ deliberate avoidance of intrigue, sub-plot and digressions, and in his emphasis upon the obsessive sameness of certain activities? While the parents lay on lavish family banquets and then go off to their nocturnal sacrifices, the hero retreats into his own world of sleeping and dreaming. Eustathios was clearly familiar with many of the ancient romances, but he has chosen to alter the whole perspective.

Eustathios’ use of classical allusions has already been excellently analysed by M. Gigante.³² I shall restrict myself here to some indicative examples, and a few additional comments. Most extensive are the allusions to themes, motifs and *topoi* in Homer and Hesiod. They are always indirect, and closely

31. Two characteristic examples in ancient romances are Lycaenium, the young city girl married to an elderly villager who gives Daphnis a practical lesson in the arts of love (*Daphnis and Chloe* III.15–19); and Melitte’s behaviour to Kleitophon (Ach. Tat. V.13–14, 26–7). The role of Saracen women in French *chansons de geste* is discussed by Schlauch, *Antecedents of the English Novel*, pp. 11–13.

32. Gigante, op. cit., pp. 170–81, discusses Eustathios’ use of allusion, citation, motifs, *topoi* and mythical themes, and concludes that the effect is intentionally humorous.

integrated into the prose style. Thus, when Hysminias congratulates Sosthenes on the excellence of his garden with the words *χρυσέαν ἐπλέξω μοι τὴν σειράν* (1.4), the author evokes not only the Homeric *σειράν χρυσεῖην ἐξ οὐρανόθεν πεδιόνδε* (*Il.* 8.19), but also, rather comically, the whole ‘aurea catena Homeri’ of medieval neo-platonism.³³ When Kratisthenes wakes Hysminias on the first night to discuss his astonishing conquest of Hysmine, he teasingly adapts the Homeric *οὐ χρῆ παννύχιον εὐδῆν βουληφόρον ἄνδρα* (*Il.* 2.24) to *οὐ χρῆ παννύχιον εὐδῆν ἄνδρα κήρυκα* (1.13). Similarly, when he drags Hysminias back to bed after his sallies into the garden, he appropriately uses the words addressed by the herald Idaios to Ajax during his duel with Hector (*Il.* 7.282): *νῦξ δ’ ἤδη τελέθει, ἀγαθὸν καὶ νυκτὶ πιθέσθαι* (IV.19). These are just two examples of the familiar literary repartee which characterizes Hysminias’ relationship with Kratisthenes—a kind of humour, one may imagine, indulged in by well-bred Byzantine schoolboys. When Hysmine retires to bed with a headache after her father has announced her arranged marriage, she says *γλυκεῖα μήτερ, ἀλγέω τὴν κεφαλὴν* (VI.3), a deliberately grotesque amalgamation of the Sapphic *γλύκη μαῦτερ* (*fr.* 102 L-P) and Theokritos’ *ἀλγέω τὰν κεφαλάν* (*Id.* III.52). It is by means of classical allusion that Eustathios achieves a parodic effect in the scene where the captain disposes of Hysmine (VII.12–14), and a more subtle humour when Hysminias is cheered out of his melancholia by remembering Theokritos (*Id.* III.37) when his right eye keeps twitching (IX.3). Other classical allusions range from Aeschylus (*Eumenides*), Sophocles (*Ajax*, *Electra*) and Euripides (*Hecuba*, *Medea*) to Aristophanes (*Clouds*) and a fragment of Chaeremon.³⁴ Such varied and extensive use of classical sources suggests, not a miserable pedant indulging in slavish imitation, but a scholar well-acquainted with a wide range of classical texts (some possibly now lost), poking gentle fun at romance convention. Gigante goes so far as to conclude: ‘tutto il romanzo è soltanto un gioco letterario’. This is, in my opinion, a one-sided view; but Hunger’s definition of the nature of *mimesis* in Byzantine

33. Cf. Plato *Theat.* 153C; Eur. *Or.* 982; Eustathios, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes*, ed. M. van der Valk, I (Leiden, 1971).

34. See Gigante, *op. cit.*, pp. 176–9.

'high' literature is certainly appropriate to Eustathios: its art lies not in imitation for its own sake but in variation, in different ways and for different effects.³⁵

Eustathios' style has been generally condemned as tedious, repetitious and pretentious.³⁶ Superficially, the criticism appears valid; but what critics have failed to perceive is that his style—both linguistic and literary—can be shown to have an artistic function. First, stylistic exaggeration is not merely an artificial device, but an integral part of his linguistic expression, with a deliberately parodic effect. Second, as Margaret Schlauch has observed, classical devices can be used in the medieval romance to heighten realism.³⁷ Solitary monologue, for example, differs from its modern counterpart in employing 'objectified discourse', hence conflicting impulses within the individual are conveyed by allegorical figures who engage in formal *quaestio* and *disputatio*.³⁸ In *Hysmine and Hysminias*, Hysminias tells Kratisthenes after his first dream of Eros that Zeus and Love are two warring forces within his heart, which is like a beleaguered citadel fired at from two sides (III.2). The war metaphor is sustained throughout the next dream to convey his struggle to break down Hysmine's resistance and sense of peace after victory.³⁹ It enables Eustathios to be explicitly but not

35. H. Hunger, 'On the imitation (*mimesis*) of antiquity in Byzantine literature', *DOP*, XXIII–XXIV (1969–70), 17–38.

36. Especially condemnatory are Rohde's comments, *op. cit.*, p. 561: 'Die Darstellung ist eines wahnsinnig gewordenen Achilles Tatius, nämlich die auf den äussersten Gipfel getriebene Affektation eines barbarischen Pedanten. Ein ungeheuerlich breit ergossener Redeschwall soll durch die mühseligste Witzelei, die sinnlosesten, alliterierenden Worthäufungen, alberne Antithesen, eingesprengte Glanzstellen zahlreicher älterer Autoren . . . anziehender gemacht werden; und das Ergebnis ist doch nur ein, selbst den Achilles überbietendes Wortgekräusel und peinliches Difteln in armselig anspruchsvollen Phrasen, denen die ganz korrupte . . . sich behagende Redeweise des, nach seiner eigenen Meinung offenbar rein attisch schreibenden Dichters noch einen besonders barbarischen Zusatz gibt.'

37. *Antecedents of the English Novel*, pp. 1–10, 16–23. Gigante, *op. cit.*, p. 169, considers that the detailed *ekphrasis* in Eustathios' romance give colour to the narrator's mood.

38. Schlauch, *Antecedents of the English Novel*, p. 20.

39. III.7: *Γίνομαι καὶ περὶ τὸ στερνὸν τῆς κόρης· ἡ δ' ἀντέχεται μάλα γενναίως, καὶ ὅλη συστέλλεται, καὶ ὅλον σώματι περιτείζει τὸ μαζόν, ὥς πόλιν ἀκρόπολις, καὶ χερσὶ, καὶ τραχήλῳ, καὶ πῶγῳ τοὺς μαστοὺς καταφράττει καὶ περιφράττει· καὶ κάτωθεν μὲν ἀνέχει τὰ γόνατα ὥς ἐξ ἀκροπόλεως δὲ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἀκροβολίζει*

offensively erotic; at the same time, the concrete detail of the imagery is also suggestive of sexual combat.

There is a laboured artificiality about these sustained metaphors, it is true; but not all the imagery is formal and archaizing. Some of the shorter similes, if not original, make an immediate impact, such as the meeting of lovers' eyes: *ὥσπερ γὰρ ἀνεμος ἐν καλᾷ καὶ χόρτῳ ἀνάπτει πῦρ μαραινομένοις, οὕτως ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐν ἐρῶσιν ἀνάπτει τὸν ἔρωτα* (III.10).⁴⁰ Occasionally, the motifs are closer to those of popular poetry than to those of classical models. Panthia, seeing the ill-omened outcome of their sacrifices for Hysmine's wedding, laments her daughter's fate: *Ζεῦ πάτριε, μὴ μου τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐκκόφῃς· μὴ μου τὸν λύχνον σβέσῃς· μὴ μου πρόρριζον τὸν στάχυν ἐκτίλῃς· μὴ μοι τοῦ γένους παντὸς ἀποκείρῃς τὸν βόστρυχα* (VI.10). These motifs—deprivation of sight, quenching of a lighted lamp, reaping of unripe corn—belong to a traditional stock of images which can be traced in Byzantine religious and vernacular laments of the Virgin, as well as in modern *moirologia*.⁴¹ Dianteia's lament for Hysminias shows the same allusive technique and range of imagery as the popular laments, in spite of the rhetorical form and stylized antitheses.⁴² These examples are insufficient to establish a case, but the possibility that learned writers drew on popular tradition as well as on classical sources for much of their imagery cannot be excluded, and a

τὸ δάκρυον, μονοноῦ λέγουσα, “Ἡ φιλῶν μαλαχθῇ μοι τοῖς δάκρυσιν, ἢ μὴ φιλῶν ὀκνήσει τὸν πόλεμον.” Ἐγὼ δὲ μᾶλλον τὴν ἦταν αἰδοῦμενος, ἀντέχομαι βιαίτερον, καὶ μόλις νικῶ, καὶ νικῶν ἡττῶμαι, καὶ ὁλος ἀμβλύνομαι.

40. Equally effective is the simile used by Hysminias to describe the dreams he experiences after seeing Hysmine again in Artykomis, X.4: *ὥσπερ γὰρ νοῦς πεινῶντος ἄρτον φαντάζεται, καὶ ὕδωρ δνειροὶ τῷ διψῶντι, οὕτως ἐρώση ψυχῇ πάντα πρὸς ἔρωτα μεταπλάττεται, καὶ διαλογισμοί, καὶ τὰ καθ' ὕπνου φαντάσματα*. Hysminias' speeches to Hysmine are on the whole more stylized and artificial, but sometimes they have the quality of love-lyrics, as in V.20: *Ὑσμίνη παρθένε, μέλημα ἐμόν, φῶς ἐμῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, πηγὴ μοι στάζουσα μέλιτος, δμβρε χαρίτων* . . .

41. See Margaret Alexiou, *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition* (Cambridge, 1974), pp. 187–9, 195–7; ‘The Lament of the Virgin in Byzantine Literature and Modern Greek Folk Song’, *BMGS*, I (1975). 121.

42. X.10. For a detailed analysis of the imagery of this lament, see Alexiou, *The Ritual Lament*, pp. 188–9, 191.

detailed study of the imagery in all the learned romances would be worth pursuing.⁴³

Is the romance just a 'tour de force', or a literary joke, as Gigante argued? I believe that there is another dimension, that of psychology. Hunger, although he does not analyse the romance in depth, notes that many details, especially in the early part, recall modern naturalism: 'Makrembolites hat den Hauptakzent auf das psychologische Detail gelegt'.⁴⁴ This psychological dimension is achieved primarily through Eustathios' skilful use of dreams, which occupy a greater part of this romance than of any other I have read. Hysminias is the only character who dreams: there are two dreams on the second night, three on the third, one on the sixth and seventh, and only one in the final section, with no details given. His most intensive period of dreaming therefore coincides precisely with his awakening sexuality. Whereas in the ancient romances, dreams are usually portentous rather than erotic,⁴⁵ all Hysminias' dreams are personal or erotic.

The quality of detail given in the dreams enables us to distinguish further two types of personal dream: first, dreams of wish-fulfilment (what modern psychologists call 'simple, undistorted empathic fantasy'), such as dreams of love-making, elopement, lulling of waves; and second, dreams arising from guilt, anxiety or fear, such as the dream of being caught in

43. It is interesting to note that in spite of the overtly pagan atmosphere of Theodore Prodromos' romance, *Rhodanthe and Dosikles*, the references to popular mythical figures which have survived to this day, such as the Nereids, Hades and Charon, Moira and Tyche, are concrete, and especially common in the imagery; see IV.225, 251–2; VI.315; IX.39–943, 182–3, ed. R. Hercher, *Erotici Scriptores Graeci* (Leipzig, 1858), II. The same is true of Niketas Eugenianos' romance, *Drosilla and Charikles*, ed. J. Boissonade, in: G. Hirschig, *Erotici Scriptores*. See especially II.169–85, 188–90; IV.301; VI.204–5, 535; VIII.218–25. Gigante, *op. cit.*, pp. 169, 180, has observed that in Eustathios' romance, the figures of Eros, Poseidon and Tyche are conceived not as divinities in their own right but as creations of Hysminias' fantasy, so that the pagan setting is not just a piece of artificial staging, but integrated into contemporary reality.

44. Hunger, 'Die byzantinische Literatur der Komnenenzeit', p. 74.

45. See, for example, *Daphnis and Chloe*, I.7; Ach. Tat. I.3; II.11; IV.1. Eustathios may have borrowed the idea and the setting of Hysminias' dream in III.5–7 from Ach. Tat. I.6; but Kleitophon's dream is far less explicit in its eroticism.

flagrante by the girl's mother and of being pursued by avenging women. Thus, it is as a direct result of his first dream of Eros that he begins to fall in love with Hysmine (III.1–3). Eros' power is not an external, supernatural force, but a natural process of the hero's subconscious. He then wakes up, discusses the dream with his friend, and allows the dream to influence his conscious intentions: next time he will respond to Hysmine's advances, initiate his own, and lie with her if she agrees (III.4). Then he sleeps again, and experiences what can only be interpreted as a 'wet dream' (III.7).⁴⁶ His age is not specified; but if this dream indicates physical puberty, the transformation in his behaviour towards Hysmine from this point has a perfectly natural explanation.

The dreams are rendered even more convincing by the number of details they contain which can be explained in terms of the dreamer's recent experience ('dream-association'). Hysminias' dream of enslavement by Eros occurs after he has seen the frieze in the garden and discussed its significance at length with Kratisthenes (II.7–10, III.1). His dream of making love to Hysmine after a banquet (III.5–7) takes place after a real banquet (II.12–14), when his curiosity was aroused by Hysmine's advances but his desire suppressed (II.11). With his anxiety dream, the association with reality occurs on three levels (V.3–5). It follows a few hours after he encountered Hysmine in the garden, a tryst which was cut short by a woman calling her from the house (IV.21–2), a detail from the immediate past. It is also an expression of his shame and guilt at having transgressed the code of behaviour proper to a herald and a guest, feelings which had been preying on his mind just before he fell asleep

46. ἡλγουν, ἠθύμουν, καινόν τινα τρόμον ἔτρεμον, ἡμβλυνόμεν τὴν ὄψιν, ἐμαλθακίζομεν τὴν ψυχὴν, τὴν ἰσχὺν ἐχαυνούομεν, ἐνωθρευόμην τὸ σῶμα, ἐπείχετό μοι τὸ ἄσθμα, πυκνὸν κατεπάλλετό μοι τὸ περικάρδιον, καὶ τις ὁδὴν γλυκάζουσα κατέδραμέ μοι τὰ μέλη, καὶ οἶον ὑπεργαργάλισε, καὶ ὅλον με κατέσχευ ἄρρητος ἔρωσ ἀνεκλάλητος, ἀφραστός· καὶ τι πέπονθα, νῆ τὸν Ἔρωτα, οἶον οὐδέποτε πέπονθα. Εὐθὺς οὖν ἐξέπτη μου τῶν χειρῶν ἡ κόρη, ἢ μᾶλλον εἰπεῖν οἰκειότερον ἐκείναι νωθρῶς οὕτω καὶ μαλακῶς τῆς κόρης ἐξέπεσον· ἐξέπτη δέ μοι καὶ ὁ ὕπνος εὐθὺς ἐκ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, καὶ ἠνώμην, νῆ τὸν Ἔρωτα, οὕτω καλὸν ἀπολέσας δνειρον, καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς φίλης Ὑσμίνης ἀποσπασθεῖς, καὶ ἤθελον πάλιν ὑπνοῦν, καὶ τι πάσχειν ἐρωτικὸν ἐζήτουν, οἶον καθ' ὕπνου ἐπαθον. III.8: Καὶ ἡμην ὅλος ἐωνημένος τῇ κόρῃ, καὶ ψυχῇ, καὶ σῶμα, καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς, καὶ ὅλος ἐκβεβακχευμένος ἐξ ἐρωτος.

(IV.24). This reflects 'focal conflict', in which guilt is the reactive motive of the dream. The shouting and screaming heard in his dream as Panthia and her avenging women are part of concurrent reality, since at that very moment Sosthenes is banging at the door and telling him to get up and greet the crowd which is clamouring outside to crown him as herald (V.6). This interplay between dream and reality, which operates on several levels, not only evokes the half-waking, half-sleeping world of the dreamer, but also creates for the reader an atmosphere of fantasy, in which dream and reality are no longer clearly distinguished.

If the dreams in this romance are primarily erotic, it is conversely true that the eroticism is mainly confined to the dreams. Hysminias, in his actual encounters with Hysmine, is a pale shadow of the figure of his dreams. It is interesting to speculate on possible precedents for erotic dreams which Eustathios may have known. The 'unseemly love episodes', as Photios called them,⁴⁷ in Achilles Tatius' romance, were certainly familiar to him, but they differ in that they are explicit, and form an integral part of Kleitophon's experiences or conversations, whereas Eustathios' eroticism is more suggestive, belonging to the phantasmagoria of dreams. It is the kind of material deliberately explored by twentieth-century novelists to penetrate the inner complexities of an individual's *psyche*, but not usually associated with Byzantine learned romances of the twelfth century. It is conceivable that Provençal courtly love poetry from the late eleventh century, where the two elements of eroticism and dreams are frequently combined, was known in Byzantium through the Crusaders; but there is no evidence for this, nor is there anything specific in the material to suggest a connection. More probably, Eustathios was freely adapting the erotic material of the ancient romance in a new context, suggested perhaps by the familiar 'temptation dreams' of the saints' lives.⁴⁸ Here too, he was experimenting.

47. *Bibliotheca*, cod. 87, ed. R. Henry (Les Belles Lettres [Paris, 1960]), II: *ἔστι δὲ δραματικόν, ἔρωτάς τινας ἀτόπους ἐπεισάγον* . . . He condemns the content of Achilles Tatius' romance, but recommends the purity of his Attic style. There is no doubt that the works of both Achilles Tatius and Heliodoros continued to be read—and plagiarized—throughout the Byzantine period.

48. The best examples are the dreams which beset the young Saint Antony, see *Vita S. Antonii*, ed. B. de Montfaucon (Paris, 1698), 5. The connections and

Eustathios' innovations in narrative technique, his bold eroticism, and his highly selective use of conventional episodes and stock devices, combine to add two new dimensions to the history of the romance: humour (even parody) and psychology. His work is more than a re-sifting of old ingredients in a new bowl. Because of the penetration of his hero's world, where dream and reality are blended into fantasy, and where even the external reality is, for the first time, explicitly fictional, *Hysmine and Hysminias* is closer to the modern novel than any other Byzantine literature I have read. At the same time, the work is esoteric: its language and style presuppose a close knowledge of classical literature, and it was clearly intended for a highly cultivated audience. For these reasons it could not lead to any major new departures in the history of the romance such as occurred in the west from the thirteenth century onwards. But in spite of the strictures of the historians of literature, the number, date and diffusion of the manuscripts testify to the fact that it was widely read from the time of its composition until the eighteenth century.⁴⁹ Its popularity is due to Eustathios' treatment of ancient models, which reflects a dynamic rather than a static attitude towards the past.

University of Birmingham

interactions between hagiography and romance in western medieval tradition are investigated in a collection of articles entitled 'Medieval Hagiography and Romance', ed. P. M. Clogan, *Medievalia et Humanistica*, VI (Cambridge, 1975).

49. See above, note 12. The exact nature of its readership is difficult to determine without a thorough investigation of the place of origin of all manuscripts. The sub-title *drama* was a literary convention, and does not imply stage performance; but the possibility of court recitation cannot be excluded, and the work may have reached a wider audience than the highly-educated minority who could have read it. Dunlop, *op. cit.*, 1, p. 82, notes that certain features were imitated by subsequent western authors, specifically by Jorge de Montemayor in his Spanish pastoral romance *Diana* (sixteenth century), and by Honoré d'Urfé (1567–1625) in his French romance *Astrée*. Specific evidence for the knowledge of Greek romances in Iceland, transmitted by Norse and Icelandic visitors in Byzantium from the eleventh century, is considered by M. Schlauch, *Romance in Iceland* (Princeton University Press, New York, 1934), pp. 55–68. She concludes that while the principal ancient romances may have been known in Iceland from Latin translations rather than from the Greek, small episodes and specific details in Icelandic stories point to a knowledge of a wider range of Byzantine learned and vernacular romances, which could only have been gained by direct contact with Byzantium.

LIFE IN THE TOMB

by Stratis Myrivilis

**Translated from the modern Greek original
by Peter Bien**

This war novel, written in journal form by a sergeant in the trenches, is the single most successful serious work of fiction in Greece since its publication in 1923—despite its inclusion on lists of censored books. Published in many translations—none in English until now—it is one of the most sensitive novels to come out of the First World War—a meditative, lyrical, yet harshly realistic account of trench warfare on the Macedonian front. *Published for Dartmouth College.* \$13.50



**University Press of New England
Box 979, Hanover, New Hampshire 03755**

HELLENISM AND THE FIRST GREEK WAR OF LIBERATION (1821–1830): CONTINUITY AND CHANGE

**Edited by N. P. Diamandouros, J. P. Anton, J. A.
Petropoulos, and P. Topping, and with an introduction by
J. A. Petropoulos**

This book is a collection of essays prepared by a group of Hellenists at the invitation of THE MODERN GREEK STUDIES ASSOCIATION, which offers it to the public as its second major publication. These essays, ranging widely both chronologically and geographically, examine the relationship of the first Greek War of Liberation to the history of Hellenism from antiquity to the twentieth century.

**THE INSTITUTE FOR BALKAN STUDIES,
TSIMISKI 45,
THESSALONIKI, GREECE**